

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249FUS-1

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are intended to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed May 20, 2005.

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Paton (GB 2207096). Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paton in view of Bonfilio et al (4,442,685). Applicants note that claims 12-19 were cancelled in the amendment filed March 21, 2005.

In the amendment filed on March 21, 2005, Applicants noted that independent claim 5 and dependent claim 2 each recite an "interface ... configured to conform to a standardized interface system wherein ... electrical connection components of the body and chassis complement each other." (underlining added for emphasis). Applicants further noted that Paton does not disclose "electrical connection components" of a "body and chassis [that] complement each other." Paton discloses no electrical connection components on vehicle body 12. Indeed, Paton does not disclose electrical components of any kind, connective or otherwise, on the body 12. Therefore, Applicants submitted, claims 2 and 5 are not anticipated by Paton, and the rejection of claims 2 and 5 are improper. Applicants have amended claim 1 in the present amendment to include all the limitations of claim 2.

In the amendment filed March 21, 2005, Applicants respectfully requested that the Examiner either cite text from Paton to indicate where Paton expressly teaches such electrical connection components of the body or, alternatively, show that such connections are necessary, as required for a finding of inherency.

The Examiner did not address this deficiency in the teaching of Paton in the final Office action mailed May 20, 2005.

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249PUS-1

Claims 3 and 4 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 6-11 ultimately depend from claim 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

Also, as noted in the amendment filed March 21, 2005 (but not addressed in the final Office action mailed May 20, 2005), claim 9 recites "at least one releasable connector for releasably attaching the enclosure to the floor." The Examiner states that Paton "teaches an enclosure connected to the floor for sheltering occupants within the body," but fails to address "at least one releasable connector for releasably attaching the enclosure to the floor." Paton may teach connectors for connecting a *body* 12 to a *chassis* 10, but Paton does not teach "at least one releasable connector for releasably attaching the enclosure to the floor," as recited by claim 9.

#### CONCLUSION

This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed May 20, 2005. The amendments to the claims and the remarks in support of the amended and rejected claims are believed to place this application in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

ADRIAN B. CHERNOFF ET AL

By 

Robert C. Corbett  
Reg. No. 51,089  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 20, 2005

S/N: 10/824,406

Atty Dkt No. GP-302549 / GM0249PUS-1

**QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC**  
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Suite 520  
Novi, MI 48375  
Phone: 248-380-9300  
Fax: 248-380-8968

*On behalf of:*

Kathryn A. Marra  
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION  
Legal Staff Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000